

COMMISSION CONFERENCE

FEBRUARY 20, 2001

Agenda Item

Page

I-A	Nuisance Abatement Board	1
I-B	Razor Wire Fences	7
I-C	Proposed Use of Former New River Post Office Site	9
I-D	Request to Name Holiday Park Baseball Field after Fred J. Zloch	14
I-E	Homeless Assistance Center (HAC) – 2000 Compliance Audit	15
II-A	Parks General Obligation Bond (GOB) Quarterly Report – Fourth Quarter 2000 (October – December)	18
III-B	Advisory Board Vacancies: 1. Budget Advisory Board (Deferred) 2. Cemeteries Board of Trustees (Deferred) 3. Community Appearance Board (Deferred) 4. Community Services Board (Deferred) 5. Insurance Advisory Board (Deferred) 6. Nuisance Abatement Board (Deferred) 7. Unsafe Structures & Housing Appeals Board (Deferred) 8. Marine Advisory Board	20 20 21 21 21 21 21 21
IV	City Commission Reports: 1. Long Range City Plan 2. ULI Seminar 3. County Summit 4. 1880 South Federal Highway 5. Margarita Island, Venezuela	21 22 22 22 23

COMMISSION CONFERENCE**2:06 P.M.****FEBRUARY 20, 2001**

Present: Mayor Naugle

Commissioners Hutchinson, Katz, Moore and Smith

Also Present: City Manager, City Attorney, City Clerk and Police Sergeant

I-A – Nuisance Abatement Board

The City Commission was scheduled for a joint discussion with the Nuisance Abatement Board regarding issues of interest and related matters. After introductions, Commissioner Moore noted that February, 2001 was the third anniversary of this Board, and he applauded its members for their efforts and the great changes that had resulted. His purpose in suggesting this discussion had been to learn what hurdles the Board faced and hear ideas for making it even more productive than in the past.

Commissioner Moore said there were several “problem sites” that caused him concern. One was “The Freeze” on Sistrunk Boulevard. He stated that it was a nuisance site, and the Board had discussed the property several times. However, very little seemed to have been done, and there had been numerous delays and extensions afforded the property owner. Commissioner Moore felt there was a similar situation involving the “Four Corners” at Northwest 9th Avenue at Sistrunk Boulevard. He stated that the community felt these businesses were magnets for problems. Another example was a store at 22nd Avenue and Sistrunk Boulevard, the “Green Store,” which he did not believe had ever been brought before the Nuisance Abatement Board. It was his understanding that there had been numerous incidents of drug sales, loitering, etc., at this location. Commissioner Moore wondered if the Board was as frustrated with these situations as he and if there was anything the Commission could do to assist.

Mayor Naugle understood 2 of those properties had been brought before the Board. Commissioner Moore agreed that was correct. In fact, they had been on the Board’s agenda several times, but there always seemed to be a reason why they were treated very gently. He believed the intent of the Board had been to address nuisance properties when other methods had failed. Based on a reading of the minutes, he felt continuances and extensions were granted too frequently in certain cases.

Commissioner Smith shared Commissioner Moore’s concerns. He felt the Board was often too conservative, and he wanted its members to get tough. Commissioner Smith understood the Board was concerned about risks, but he thought that was an issue for the City administration to

address, while the Board's role was to address properties that wreaked havoc on the community. Commissioner Moore hoped Board members could tell the Commission about any restraints they felt hampered the process.

Mr. Stephen Goldenberg, Chairman of the Board, did not agree with Commissioners Moore and Smith. He believed the Board had acted within its power. In the case of "The Freeze," he recalled that the service had been disputed, although the Board had found the property to be a nuisance months ago. Mr. Goldenberg believed thousands of dollars in fines had accrued on that property. He thought the Board had found properties to be nuisances in 80% to 85% of the cases presented, but the Board did not have the ability to determine how to address such nuisances. That task fell to the Police Department and the City Prosecutor, and they provided recommendations on which the Board voted.

Mr. Goldenberg stated that the Board's power was really very limited by the State Statute, but they tried to do everything within its power to address problem properties. However, he did not believe the Board had the power to close down any business. Mr. Goldenberg said one problem was the appearance of a conflict in terms of the City Prosecutor, *Mr. Scott Walker*. He advised that the Board had no one to turn to with legal questions since Mr. Walker represented the City.

Commissioner Moore understood the Board felt it needed independent legal representation. Mr. Goldenberg agreed that was correct, and he believed the issue had been raised at the very first meeting of the Board. He thought this lack might account for the Board's conservatism, although it usually levied the maximum fines allowed by the Statute. In fact, there was some question as to whether or not the fines being levied exceeded the maximum amount the City could collect.

Mr. Walker reported that the Statute allowed a fine of up to \$15,000, which represented an increase from \$5,000. He believed the Board felt there should be no cap on fines. Commissioner Smith wondered how many properties had paid fines of \$15,000. Mr. Walker explained that compliance was achieved in almost 90% of the cases. He stated that the 2 properties mentioned by Commissioner Moore that had come before the Board had been the first 2 that had been liened and foreclosure threatened. Commissioner Moore wondered why foreclosure had not occurred already. Mr. Goldenberg advised that was beyond the Board's purview.

Mr. Walker explained that the property titles were already clouded by the Board's Orders, and there had been a case in which the fines had been paid because the property could not be sold otherwise due to the lien. Commissioner Moore understood property owners were unconcerned by liens because there was no effect unless they wanted to sell.

The City Attorney noted that this issue came up periodically in association with the Code Enforcement Board process. He was not aware of any files being sent to his office for foreclosure arising out of the Nuisance Abatement Board process, based on a quick phone call. However, he would check further with the Police Department in this regard. Mayor Naugle agreed that simply clouding title had no effect until the owner tried to sell.

Mr. Goldenberg stated that fines ran on a daily basis until compliance was achieved, so once the Board made its ruling, the case was not presented again. He explained that the Board had no involvement in fine collection or foreclosure. Commissioner Smith wondered why the Board had not recommended to the City Commission that The Freeze be closed when it had been presented on 4 or 5 occasions. He believed the City Commission could take that action when it

became apparent that no other method would cause compliance. Mr. Goldenberg replied that the Board was not involved in cases after a finding had been made. The Board could presume fines were running if compliance was not achieved, but there was no confirmation provided. He thought perhaps the City should present the cases again at some point.

Commissioner Smith thought the Nuisance Abatement Board had jurisdiction over cases for a period of one year. He believed the Board could recommend closure of a business to the City Commission, although it could not close a business itself. Mr. Goldenberg had not been aware that was possible under the Statute. Commissioner Moore stated that once a fine had reached the maximum \$15,000 and compliance had not been achieved, the City Commission could interrupt the business itself for 6 months. Mr. Goldenberg did not think it should be the Board's role because the enforcement aspect was a function of the City after the Board had made a finding. Once the fine reached the maximum, he saw no reason for the Board to reconsider. Rather, it should go automatically to the City Commission.

Mayor Naugle wondered how the Board would feel about considering recommendations from the City Prosecutor that a business be closed. Mr. Goldenberg was not sure the Board had that power, and the Board had no lawyer to advise one way or the other.

The City Attorney explained that when the State Statute had originally been adopted, one of the first challenges had involved a St. Petersburg case. In that case, the courts had found that a closure order, while it could be enforced, represented a "taking." Therefore, although St. Petersburg had closed a business for a year, it had also paid the business for lost profits, damages, etc. He believed that was one concern of the Board, and now the Commission was suggesting that it forward those cases to them without regard to cost. The City Attorney believed that was something new to the Board, but the Commission was inviting them to do so. He noted that the City Commission would have to address the potential problem of costs.

Mayor Naugle recalled the St. Petersburg case, and everyone had been disappointed that they would have to rely on the fines. At that time, the fine allowed amount had been increased. He thought the City's lobbyist could try to have that amount raised again to \$50,000 or \$100,000.

Mr. Harry MacGrotty noted that the Board typically had to deal with two entities on properties – the owner and the tenant. Oftentimes, the tenant was the real problem, and the owner was not overly concerned as long as there was still a cash flow from the tenant. Mr. MacGrotty thought the City should seek satisfaction from the tenants in some cases, perhaps through the licensing process in order to interrupt the cash flow to the owner.

Commissioner Smith agreed the only way to achieve compliance was to interrupt the operation of the business. He stated that the City had the power to do it, although there was some risk. Commissioner Moore understood the City Attorney's cautiousness due to the St. Petersburg case. Nevertheless, that City had stopped the business that had been interrupting the quality of life in that community. He felt that was a risk worth taking.

Commissioner Smith believed there was a philosophical division on the Board, with some members sharing his feelings and those of Commissioner Moore. He felt the Commission should provide the direction.

Mr. Bob Bissonnette, Vice-Chairman of the Board, said he viewed the Board's purpose as one of obtaining compliance rather than being punitive. Therefore, the only circumstances under which the Board generally agreed to waive fines was pending compliance. Otherwise, he felt the Board was tough, but its hands were tied. Mr. Bissonnette believed the Board's last meeting minutes showed that it had requested a foreclosure, and there had been heated discussions about the 2 properties mentioned earlier. In fact, he had wondered if the Board had any contempt powers because there had been witnesses and tenants who were clearly disregarding the Board's orders, and the Board had instructed the City to foreclose. Mr. Bissonnette was sure that initiation of foreclosure proceedings would evoke some response.

Ms. Helen Surovek agreed that some issues had not been very clear, but she felt greater clarity had been brought to the Board's role today. She noted that people appearing before the Board were usually represented by counsel.

Mr. Goldenberg advised that fines were not abated if a continuance was granted. He recalled one occasion in which fines had been stopped because there had been some question about obtaining a permit. Mr. Goldenberg explained that a fence, for example, might be required, but there could be a number of City obstacles for property owners to overcome before permits could be issued, and the Board tried to allow a reasonable amount of time.

Mr. Goldenberg referred to The Freeze. He stated that the Board had felt the overhang should be removed because it had provided a place for people to loiter and cause problems. However, the owner had come back with an engineer who had indicated that removal of the overhang would interfere with the structural integrity of the building. Mr. Goldenberg did not think the Commission would want the Board to order someone to destroy a building. He also stated that the Board had only been aware of a cap on fines a month or two ago.

Commissioner Moore stated that if a permit had been pulled by The Freeze for the fence, then someone had done a very sloppy job, which could not be in conformance with the Code. Mayor Naugle was concerned that discussion in this regard might jeopardize the case against The Freeze since its representatives were not present, etc. Therefore, he suggested that the conversation focus on the general philosophy of the Board.

Ms. Surovek wondered whose job it was to check if someone had obtained a permit and constructed something improperly. Commissioner Smith said that work was inspected when permits were issued. However, if a property owner was ordered by the Board to install a fence, and they had installed one without permits, that would not satisfy the order. Mr. Surovek was not sure there was communication in that regard back to the Board if such things occurred.

Mr. Caldwell Cooper asked if the Board could demand to see permits for work required by an order. Mayor Naugle thought the Board could ask the respondent or staff to provide permit information. Mr. Goldenberg said the Board had required respondents to bring back evidence of compliance.

Mr. Goldenberg thought that if the Commission examined the meeting minutes and votes, there were very few votes that had not been unanimous. Therefore, he did not believe there were any major philosophical differences among the members.

Commissioner Smith said he had been referring to input he received privately from some of the Board members. He explained that some members felt Mr. Goldenberg took over the meetings, restricted input from some, and forced his opinions as to the final outcome of cases. In fact, he had received regular contact from members of the Board who were frustrated by the way Mr. Goldenberg conducted the meetings. Mr. Goldenberg had never received any such input, but he believed the Board could certainly vote to remove him as Chairman.

Commissioner Smith recalled an evening when there had been 50 people in the audience. He had been present, and he had felt Mr. Goldenberg had not wanted that public input. He stated that the neighborhood had been put in a terrible situation because of a particular property owner, and they had finally had an opportunity to appear, but Mr. Goldenberg had not allowed them to present any testimony.

Mayor Naugle noted that many advisory boards had certain periods when general discussion was permitted. He felt that if individuals felt the process should be changed, that would be the appropriate time to discuss that type of issue. Commissioner Smith believed some of the members had made an attempt.

Mr. Goldenberg believed the Board's job was to find whether or not a nuisance existed. If someone came forward and stipulated that a property was a nuisance, there was no need for additional testimony about a fact that had already been established. He had no objection to anyone providing recommendations as to how a nuisance should be cured, but he acknowledged limiting repetitive conversation during the Board's meetings. Mr. Goldenberg thought the Board was entirely supportive of his efforts to run productive meetings, rather than having 50 people repeating the same things to persuade the Board to make the finding that had already been stipulated.

Mayor Naugle pointed out that at any time during a meeting, a Board member could raise his hand to indicate a desire to hear from the public or anyone else. Mr. Goldenberg agreed that was true and it happened. Mayor Naugle believed the Commission had provided direction that it wanted recommendations from the Board as to closing problem businesses when necessary. The Commission would make the ultimate decision, and he thought that would send an important message.

Commissioner Hutchinson thought there must be some kind of a glitch in the system because the Board apparently did not know when Code Enforcement staff acted on its orders. She wondered if Code Enforcement staff was present at the meetings. She felt there was some lack of communication between the Board and staff. Ms. Surovek explained that the Board's meetings were similar to this one with bantering back and forth and no real clarity. Commissioner Hutchinson thought the Board needed legal representation and the presence of Code Enforcement staff at its meetings.

Mr. Cooper said he had been told that Code issues and nuisance issues were two completely different matters. He had requested that the Board be provided information about any previous Code violations when properties were brought up, but he understood that could cloud opinions as to the question of nuisance. Mr. Cooper felt Code issues had a lot to do with nuisance properties, but he had been told they were completely separate issues.

Mayor Naugle asked if someone from the City Attorney's Office could provide counsel to the Board. The City Attorney replied that outside counsel would be necessary to advise the Board. Mayor Naugle asked that he determine how much that would cost for a Commission Conference discussion. He agreed to do so and explained that Mr. Walker represented the City. To his knowledge, all of the Board's actions had been proper and, even on those occasions when their actions were challenged, they had been upheld. Nevertheless, the Code Enforcement Board had counsel who could be "floated" to this Board as well.

Commissioner Hutchinson asked if Mr. Walker could provide legal opinions to the Board. The City Attorney replied that Mr. Walker could tell the Board what he believed the law supported, as could respondents' attorneys. Evidently, the Board felt that put them in an uncomfortable position at times. Commissioner Hutchinson felt that was understandable and wanted to know how much it would cost to provide independent counsel. It was agreed.

Mr. Bissonnette felt that Mr. Goldenberg did an exemplary job of chairing the meetings and following the proper rules of order.

Commissioner Katz felt the Board should also be provided with all the Code information it needed. The City Manager said he would like to provide a report about the information that was forwarded to the Board at the same time the City Attorney provided cost information regarding outside counsel. It was agreed.

Mr. MacGrotty thought the root cause of the problems was that the Board was operating under a faulty Statute. He believed other cities probably had problems with it, too. Commissioner Moore suggested that a portion of a future Board meeting be dedicated to input about the statutory limitations to provide the Commission with a recommendation about how to proceed. He pointed out that there would be opportunities to address the matter during the Legislative Session.

Mr. Goldenberg understood seminars about Code enforcement were held throughout the State, and maybe it would be helpful to learn how other communities handled their nuisance abatement procedures. He also pointed out that there was strength in numbers when it came to amending legislation.

Mr. Cooper wondered why the Board only had jurisdiction over properties for 1 year. Mayor Naugle thought that was something that could be addressed through the Statute. Mr. Cooper also wondered why there was a cap on potential fines. Mayor Naugle agreed that was another issue the Board could consider during its workshop. Then, the Board could provide recommendations to the City Commission, and the City's lobbyist could help in Tallahassee.

Ms. Rita Jackson recalled that the City of Dania Beach had contacted Fort Lauderdale when it had started its nuisance abatement board. She believed it had been established 6 months ago, and Dania Beach had already foreclosed on a piece of property that had been a nuisance. It had subsequently been converted to a police substation for the community. *Ms. Jackson* thought the Board should be a little tougher in terms of granting extensions. *Mr. Steve Kelley* felt the Board had been extremely successful, and the problems mentioned were expected "growing pains." He believed that if the Board had the authority, some landlords would have been imprisoned.

Commissioner Moore noted that the City Commission often waived the bulk of fines imposed by the Code Enforcement Board when compliance had been achieved but, by the time a property reached the Nuisance Abatement Board, the situation had grown far more serious. Mr. Goldenberg was sure the Board would have no problem recommending that a business be closed now that they understood what the Commission desired.

Commissioner Smith appreciated all the time Board members volunteered to the community, although he had a serious difference of opinion with its Chairman about how the cases were handled. He agreed that once cases reached this Board, property owners did not deserve any more "breaks." Ms. Surovek felt cases had to be addressed on an individual basis.

Action: Board to provide recommendations about potential legislative action to address issues with the State Statute.

I-B – Razor Wire Fences

A discussion was scheduled about razor wire fences, as required by Mayor Naugle. Mayor Naugle displayed photographs of various properties that had razor wire fences. He noted that the Code mentioned barbed wire, but it contained no mention of razor wire. Mayor Naugle believed people were using it because of robberies, but they were being cited for having an unpermitted accessory use. He pointed out that there was some illegal razor wire at the City's Public Works Compound, Police Department, and the Trash Transfer Station right along Sistrunk Boulevard in a residential neighborhood.

Mayor Naugle reported that the Code did not allow barbed wire to be visible from a street, although there were City properties with visible barbed wire fences. He felt the City should immediately suspend enforcement activities related to razor wire, and those who had it be referred to the Police Department for advice about better ways to secure their properties. Mayor Naugle thought razor wire should perhaps be allowed in industrial areas with a recommendation from the Police Department if that was the only possibility besides vicious dogs or firearms. He certainly felt razor wire should be removed from City properties.

Commissioner Moore agreed the City should remove razor wire from its properties where it was visible from streets. He did not think razor wire should be used, although he understood the need for security. However, he could not imagine why it was necessary at the trash transfer station or the Police Department, and he did not care for its appearance. Commissioner Moore also agreed enforcement activities should be suspended while the issue was addressed further.

Mr. John Lewis, owner of Perfect Pavers at 528 Northwest 1st Avenue, explained that he'd had problems with burglaries. Since he had installed the razor wire 3 years ago, those problems had ceased. Mr. Lewis had a neighbor who had recently removed razor wire, and she had already been burglarized since that time. He stated that barbed wire did not seem to be much of a deterrent, but he was operating a business and needed security. Mr. Lewis did not care for the appearance of razor wire either and, if there were some alternatives the Police Department could suggest, he would be happy to consider it. He noted that there were quite a few properties in the area with razor wire because of the crime problem, and he had spent \$1,300 on the wire in order to protect his investment.

Commissioner Moore understood Mr. Lewis had incurred an expense in the installation of razor wire, but he must have installed it without permits. Had he applied for permits, he would have learned it was not allowed, and it really did not look good. Further, it could harm children. Mr. Lewis stated that children were not burglarizing his property. Commissioner Moore agreed it took a professional thief to steal a tractor-trailer, and razor wire would not stop a professionals. Mr. Lewis explained that the truck had been found in Pompano Beach, but the radio and other equipment had been stolen, so perhaps someone had taken it for a "joy ride."

Mr. Isaac Goldberg, of City Auto Parts, said he had operated in this location for close to 20 years, and there had been frequent break-ins in the early years. Since he had installed the razor wire 10 years ago, the burglaries had ceased. Mayor Naugle asked if anyone had suggested to him that he use the razor wire, and Mr. Goldberg said it had been his own idea.

Commissioner Katz agreed staff should provide a report in this regard for a future discussion to establish a policy about razor wire. Mayor Naugle understood enforcement would be suspended in the meantime. No one raised any objection.

Assistant Chief Bob Pusins, of the Police Department, reported that the City had a Crime Prevention Unit that provided crime prevention surveys of businesses and residences about the best ways to secure properties. He advised that the Unit would work with both of the businesses represented here today to see what could be done to strengthen their security measures. Mayor Naugle noted that if surveys were provided to those who had been cited, it might take 6 months to implement new methods and remove the razor wire.

Mr. Goldberg pointed out that the Code did not address razor wire. Commissioner Moore agreed it might not be specifically prohibited by the Code, but he had installed it without permits, which was a violation of the Code. Mr. Pete Witschen, Assistant City Manager, explained that razor wire was treated the same way as barbed wire, which had been regulated by the Code since the 1970s. He stated that staff was sensitive to the need for security, but they were also sensitive to the community's desire to raise standards of appearance. However, he had not wanted anyone to think there were no regulations with respect to razor wire.

Mayor Naugle said the City had taken the position that razor wire was prohibited. He had a letter from Mr. John Simmons, Assistant Director of Community Inspections, in that regard. Ms. Cecelia Hollar, Construction Services Director, stated that the Zoning Administrator had made an interpretation that barbed wire was similar to razor wire and, as such, should be treated the same way. She believed a Code amendment in 1997 had been intended to address aesthetics but, prior to that time, the Code had not addressed barbed wire. Mayor Naugle suggested she communicate with Mr. Kisela because his employee had sent a letter to a member of the public that razor wire was not treated like barbed wire and was prohibited.

The City Manager stated that staff would suspend enforcement and provide a history of the issue for discussion at a future Conference meeting. Commissioner Smith said that if this had involved a new initiative on the part of the Code Enforcement staff, he would like a "Friday memo" report. Mayor Naugle understood staff had pounded on someone's door at 8 o'clock on a Sunday morning, which could be dangerous in some neighborhoods. He felt that showed extremely poor judgment. Commissioner Hutchinson agreed there were more important violations to address.

Action: As discussed.

I-C – Proposed Use of Former New River Post Office Site

A discussion was scheduled on proposed uses of the former New River post office site. The City Manager recalled discussion in this regard about a year ago, and the Museum of Discovery & Science (MODS) had a proposal for use of the site. He stated that the Commission had granted a certain period of time to formalize the plan and present it in some concrete form and, if that could not be done, a report was to be presented to the Commission as to how the site could be used. The City Manager reported that there had been expressions of interest in the site from at least one other non-profit organization. He had also learned that there might be interest on the part of other for-profit organizations.

Mr. Tom Panza, of the MODS, explained that he had worked on the concept of the New World Aquarium, and that idea had eventually been merged with the Museum. Therefore, all the monies received through gifts or PECO funds would be used for their intended purpose of environmental education. He stated that his intention had been to come up with a plan that would fulfill the City's vision with an environmental education component. Mr. Panza reported that a partnership had been established with 3 civic groups to put together a model program for basic science education for young children.

Mr. Panza advised that the Jack & Jill Nursery was involved, and Nova University would provide a component through its Oceanographic Department, College of Education, and Institute of Technology. It would also provide expertise on the curriculum. Mr. Panza felt environmental education at an early age provided a head start for children to become interested in science, and the School Board also supported this idea. He noted that the Museum would provide the laboratory and a variety of exhibits.

Mr. Panza hoped for the Commission's support. He stated that this was not a "pie in the sky" scheme but a tangible plan. He believed work could get started within the next 90 days or so. Mr. Panza said he was seeking 90 days so an architect could design a state-of-the-art building that would be attractive and set off the entire area. He believed a signature building would enhance the entire community and provide a model environmental educational component. Mr. Panza thought this would serve the purpose of the Arts & Education District and the best interests of the City of Fort Lauderdale.

Mr. Panza noted that a written proposal had been submitted listing funding sources, a methodology, the intent of the 3 organizations, and the ability of those 3 organizations to bring the project fruition.

Mr. John Levinson, immediate past Chair of the Museum of Discovery & Science, felt this was an exciting idea that had come out of the partnership over the last several months. It would better utilized the resources of the Museum, and he felt the partnership of 3 was absolutely critical.

Mr. Steve Helmos said he happened to be involved with all 3 of the organizations – Jack & Jill, Nova University and the Museum – going back as far as 15 years. He was very excited about this project and hoped the Commission would favor it with its approval. He advised that all 3 organizations were committed to the project, and it would really serve the purpose of the Arts & Science District. Another individual felt one of the most exciting components was the inclusion of Jack & Jill, which helped serve much of the currently under-served community.

Commissioner Katz referred to the property the Museum had recently purchased. She inquired about the plans for that property. Mr. Panza stated that the property would be used for an environmental education center, and PECO funds would be used in great part for that facility. He envisioned a two-story building with a theater and botanical gardens.

At 3:32 P.M., Commissioner Moore left the meeting.

Mr. Panza said the project under discussion today at the Post Office Site would be the signature piece that drove the entire environmental education component. Commissioner Katz wondered why the plan for the Post Office site could not be accomplished on the Museum's property. Mr. Panza replied that there was not enough space available. He noted that the building would conform to the Code, and Jack and Jill would be provided space on the first floor. On the upper floors, there would be laboratories and other science facilities.

Mayor Naugle feared that someone would want to build a garage on the other site, and that was not what the City wanted. He asked how many kids were accommodated at the Jack and Jill School. Mr. Panza estimated 120 full-time students in the preschool, and there would also be various after-school and weekend programs.

At 3:35 P.M., Commissioner Moore returned to the meeting.

Commissioner Smith asked Mr. Panza if he had figured out how to blend with the River. Mr. Panza said that was one of the great advantages of the site, and the building would be designed to take advantage of the River and be consistent with the landscape of the area. Commissioner Smith asked Mr. Panza if he thought an aquarium was a better idea. Mr. Panza acknowledged that he loved that idea. Mayor Naugle asked if the other property had been sold to a parking company. Mr. Panza replied the property was under contract, and he understood it would be used for surface parking based on discussions with the new owner. He noted that the owner was not a developer, and he knew of no plans to use it for anything but surface parking.

Mayor Naugle understood a 40,000 to 60,000 square foot building was proposed. Mr. Panza agreed that was correct. He stated that 3 or 4 proposals would be considered for the design. Mayor Naugle asked if there had been any discussions with City staff about adding floors to the existing parking garage. Mr. Panza said there had been no discussions yet, but it would be necessary to provide required parking.

Commissioner Hutchinson understood there was a 25' height limitation in this area. Mr. Chuck Adams, Community Development, stated that the Post Office site was within the Historic District, so the height limitation was 25'. Commissioner Hutchinson was not convinced that the Jack and Jill preschool and the other programs could not be accommodated on the property behind the Museum. She pointed out that this site had languished for some time, and she thought it was time to consider other potential uses of the property. Commissioner Hutchinson favored the 25' height limitation, and she was not looking for 4- or 5-story development, but she wanted to gauge interest.

Mayor Naugle noted that the Comprehensive Plan, the Downtown Plan, and the Riverwalk Plan all referenced capitalizing on the waterfront. He was not sure using prime waterfront property for a preschool was the best idea. Mayor Naugle pointed out that day care facilities could be placed anywhere. Mr. Panza explained that this would not be a day care center. Rather, it was a preschool and educational center that would be intimately related to the waterway.

Commissioner Smith believed the City Commission was very much in favor of the educational component of the Museum, particularly as to the Charter school and at the middle school levels. He did not feel this proposal met the parameters set by the Commission.

Commissioner Moore felt the Commission should hear other ideas. Mayor Naugle noted that there had been a proposal from the Fort Lauderdale Maritime Museum. Commissioner Hutchinson noted that there had been no notice that the City Commission would be seeking proposals for this property at this meeting. She was anxious to hear about the proposal from the Maritime Museum as listed on the agenda, but she wondered if a decision was going to be made today. The City Manager advised that he was not seeking a decision but Commission guidance.

Former Mayor Robert O. Cox said he had read the proposal from the Museum of Discovery and Science, and there had been talk about a Maritime Museum in South Florida for many years. However, no suitable site had been found. He felt the Post Office building on the subject site now had a history and was eminently usable, and he thought it should be preserved. Mr. Cox believed there were plenty of new buildings coming up in the downtown area, and he thought the Historic and Riverwalk Districts would be best served by an attraction that would add to what already existed.

Mr. Cox felt the missing link in the chain was a Maritime Museum to preserve the maritime history of Fort Lauderdale, and he pointed out that about a 90% of the language in the Museum's proposal could also be applied to the Maritime Museum project in terms of education. He had always felt that educational facilities and museums were necessary components in this area, and the Maritime Museum had all kinds of educational facilities.

Mr. Cox noted there had been a Conference recently, and he had spoken with Mr. Ray Ferraro, of Nova University. They had discussed this project, and Mr. Cox had indicated he was a competitor for the site. Mr. Ferraro had seemed to feel the day care center was important, but Mr. Cox did not think it was appropriate to use the last historic building or waterfront property for that purpose. He pointed out that a day care center could just as well be served by a property a block or two away.

Mr. Cox pointed out that the only reference to the waterfront in the Museum's proposal was contained on page 8, and it indicated that diners in the day care center would have a view of the River if there were a full kitchen provided. He felt that was important and the Commission should consider the waterfront nature of the property. Mr. Cox also noted that Nova University appropriately supported anything that promoted education, but he felt a nursery school would be an abuse of this particular property.

Mr. Cox reported that the Maritime Museum could make use of the building that existed, although it did not have the money to bring up to Code at this time. Nevertheless, he had a check from one individual that would get the process started if the City should bring the building up to Code. Mr. Cox pointed out that the Museum of Discovery and Science had been given years to do something with this property, and he asked for 6 months to further the Maritime Museum project. He also had letters from other organizations that were interested, and he felt this use was more in keeping with the nature of the property. Mr. Cox added that dockage could also be provided in conjunction with the Maritime Museum with a rotating exhibit of significant vessels, and the Board of Directors of the organization would represent a cross section of the entire community.

Mr. Richard Kato, of the Marine Archaeological Council, stated that a home was needed for the Council's many maritime artifacts. He had spoken with Mr. Cox about the Maritime Museum proposal, and there had been many expressions of interest from the local marine community.

Dr. George Krickler, author of the only book about Port Everglades, said the only negative comments he'd had about it involved the lack of historical ships and a maritime museum in the "Venice of America." He did not think there could be a better site for the Maritime Museum than the Post Office site, and the group pursuing this project was dedicated to the sea. Dr. Krickler hoped the Commission would not overlook this great opportunity.

Mr. Richard Winer, Chairman of the USS Hoga Association, stated that his Association endorsed the use of the Post Office site for a Maritime Museum to perpetuate the City's maritime history as proposed by former Mayor Cox. He pointed out that there was nothing in South Florida that commemorated the area's oldest and second largest industry. Mr. Winer also believed that a preschool in this location would create a traffic nightmare in this area and that the Westside School would better serve that purpose. He added that the USS Hoga Association was prepared to donate up to \$150,000 for the immediate restoration of the Post Office building for the Maritime Museum.

Mr. Tam English thought it would be a shame to lose the old Post Office building. He pointed out that it was very old, having worked as a bag boy there when it had been an A&P Store 50 years ago. He felt this was a special opportunity to preserve Fort Lauderdale's maritime history.

Mr. George Counts, President of the Marine Historical Society, believed this would be a broad-based museum catering to yachting, local historical, maritime and Naval interests. He envisioned a maritime heritage library, marine exhibits, educational exhibits, and he expected Smithsonian guidelines to be utilized. Mr. Counts also believed there would be so many things offered for donation that it would be difficult not to hurt people's feelings because there would not be enough space for it all. He hoped the City Commission would take advantage of this once in a lifetime opportunity.

Commissioner Moore asked Mr. Cox the amount of the check that had been donated. Mr. Cox stated that if the City Commission gave his organization 6 months, he could obtain numerous pledges ranging from \$5,000 to \$50,000, subject to utilization of the subject building. Mr. Cox said he already had enough money to get the organization started and get advertising underway. He had no doubt that there would be a tremendous response.

Commissioner Moore had recently visited a maritime museum in Norfolk, VA, and it had been absolutely beautiful. It had made him more appreciative of this concept, although he liked the proposal from the Museum of Discovery and Science. However, he felt the City had given that organization more than ample opportunity to address the site. Commissioner Moore appreciated the partnerships that had been formed, but he did not believe this was the best use for the subject waterfront site.

Commissioner Moore wanted to explore the cost of bringing the existing building up to Code standards. He also felt the opportunity to use the site should be extended to others and recalled some interest from the Graves Museum. Commissioner Moore did not really consider this building to be of historical significance, but he wondered what it would cost and how long it would take to bring it up to Code. He suggested that the City initiate the RFQ (Request for Qualifications) process, which would not preclude the Museum of Discovery and Science from submitting a proposal, and he would not be opposed to demolition. Commissioner Smith was inclined to agree with Commissioner Moore as to the historic significance of the building.

Commissioner Hutchinson understood that the building might not be historically significant, but she would not want to lose the historic designation of the site and the 25' height limitation. She had read Mr. Cox's proposal with an open mind, and she found it very interesting. At the same time, she felt the opportunity should be opened to other interested parties as well, and she wondered about the cost of rehabilitation, too.

The City Manager advised that the cost of rehabilitation would depend upon the use, and cost had been estimated in the past for upgrading the air conditioning and creating a safe, clean environment for office use. He noted that if the RFQ process were initiated, respondents would have to know if building demolition was an option at all. The City Manager pointed out that return to the City was an important consideration as well in terms of this valuable piece of property.

Commissioner Hutchinson suggested Marilyn Rathburn be requested to provide a historical review of the building. The City Manager believed much of the necessary work had been completed already. He recalled that there had been some cornice found to be of historical value but, beyond that, there had been little else.

Commissioner Katz agreed requests for proposals were a good idea to determine who else might be interested while others furthered their concepts. She thought it was a good idea to maintain the façade of the building, at least, and agreed the 25' height limitation should be maintained.

Mayor Naugle thought there was consensus to open the property to other proposals for consideration, and another option would be to enter into negotiations with a non-profit agency within a certain time frame. The City Attorney explained that the Charter required that the City Commission declare its intent by resolution to lease the property, and then allow 60 days notice for a public hearing. Mayor Naugle felt the Maritime Museum should be given some time to determine what it would cost and whether it could raise the necessary funds. If an RFP was released, however, he would want it to involve something with low impact on the surrounding area, and a grand, multi-story building was not desirable.

Mayor Naugle believed use of the site should relate to history in some fashion because the Historic District was already very small, although he acknowledged that historic designation of the building itself could go either way. He felt something for visitors would be beneficial, and different events relating to the waterways would be appropriate. Mayor Naugle advised there was a maritime museum in Galveston, TX that was a wonderful attraction while still being a low impact facility.

Mr. Cox acknowledged the City Manager's goal of generating revenue for the City, but he wished to point out that the Historical Society was using City buildings. Further, the City contracted with various organizations to provide programming in parks and recreation facilities. However, he wanted to make it clear that the Maritime Museum would be a City facility. If generating revenue was the goal, Mr. Cox pointed out that a hotel could be built on the property. He had also heard the \$80,000 or \$90,000 renovation estimate, but he believed the City always over-estimated projects a little bit. Mr. Cox did not understand why the City would want to spend another year examining grandiose proposals, when it could put the building to use itself for a Maritime Museum.

Commissioner Katz felt the process should be open. She did not think it would be fair to simply accept one proposal without ever hearing what others might propose for the site. Commissioner Smith agreed an RFQ should be issued. He acknowledged that Mr. Cox's proposal had advanced, but he was concerned by the idea of the City running the Museum. Commissioner Smith preferred a private operator, and he thought the area could handle a little more intensity but not greater height.

It was the consensus of the Commission to seek proposals through the RFQ process, leaving flexibility to accommodate either a new building or renovation of the existing building. Commissioner Smith agreed some connection with the water was essential. Mayor Naugle wondered if the property should be used not for profit. Commissioner Moore did not want the City to operate a museum, but a maritime concept would be beneficial, and he thought the Commission would lean towards a maritime museum if Mr. Cox wanted to set up a 501c3 organization.

Commissioner Smith asked how long it would take to get an RFQ on the streets. Commissioner Moore thought it could be done in 60 days. The City Manager agreed it would take at least 60 days to do a good job.

Ms. Mary Jane Cochran, Broward County Archaeological Advisory Board, reported that a "blanket 501c3" had been offered so the Maritime Museum project could get off the ground.

Action: RFQ to be developed over the next 60 days as discussed.

At 4:30 P.M., the meeting was recessed. It was reconvened at 4:36 P.M.

I-D – Request to Name Holiday Park Baseball Field after Fred J. Zloch

A discussion was scheduled about a request to name one of the Holiday Park baseball fields after Fred J. Zloch, former Little League Coach, as requested by Commissioner Smith. He had asked members of the Little League to share a good idea with the Commission.

Mr. Clint Ramsden, President of Holiday Park Little League, advised that he had sent a facsimile about a proposal for a "wall of honor." He acknowledged the contributions of several individuals to the Little League, and he agreed Mr. Zloch deserved to be honored. However, there were 74 coaches who donated about 10 hours a week or 15,000 man-hours per year. There were also volunteers who did things other than coach, and there were too many to mention. Mr. Ramsden suggested that a wall on the new multipurpose building be utilized to post plaques in honor of the many individuals who did so much for the community.

Mr. Michael Mawhinney presented a video in support of his suggestion to honor Mr. Zloch.

Commissioner Smith agreed Mr. Zloch was one of the people who should certainly be honored, and he liked Mr. Ramsden's idea of a wall of honor. He suggested that the City provide a little seed money to start the wall. Commissioner Smith thought the Parks, Recreation & Beaches Advisory Board could consider applications for honorees, perhaps with two plaques posted each year.

Commissioner Moore had no objection to either idea. He believed Mr. Zloch had played a major role at Holiday Park, and he noted that Joe Carter had made similar efforts at Sunland Park. He noted there were 7 fields at Holiday Park, so perhaps each field could be named over the long term, and others could be honored with plaques. Mayor Naugle thought naming a field would be a higher honor. Commissioner Moore suggested that "making the wall" be a prerequisite to naming a field.

Commissioner Hutchinson had no objection to naming a field for Mr. Zloch, who had shaped a lot of people's lives. She also liked the idea of the wall of honor. Commissioner Katz had no strong feelings on this issue, but there could be other people who did not know someone as ambitious as Mr. Mawhinney had been with his video. Commissioner Smith preferred that a program be developed and opened to the Little League. He pointed out that Clint Ramsden, Steve Williams, Bruce Smith and others had been working with the Little League for many years. He had no objection to naming all 7 fields at this time.

At 4:52 P.M., Commissioner Moore left the meeting. He returned at 4:54 P.M.

Mr. Ramsden did not think anyone in the Little League was against naming a field, but there were lots of wonderful stories about people, like Judge Martin. Mayor Naugle believed a street had been named for him.

Mr. Phil Thornburg, Acting Director of Parks & Recreation, reported that 2 of the 7 fields had already been named for Henry Kinney and Tom O'Day, Sr. Commissioner Smith inquired about the process that had been used. Mayor Naugle believed requests had been presented to the City Commission for approval. He agreed there should be some sort of process established after this naming for Mr. Zloch.

The City Manager understood the City Commission wanted to move forward with naming a field for Mr. Zloch, and staff would develop some guidelines for a committee, which would consider individuals for plaques on the wall of honor. The Parks, Recreation & Beaches Advisory Board would then provide recommendations to the City Commission for approval, perhaps via the Consent Agenda.

Action: Approved as discussed.

I-E – Homeless Assistance Center (HAC) – 2000 Compliance Audit

A discussion was scheduled on the HAC's 2000 Compliance Audit. Mr. Horace McHugh, Assistant to the City Manager, stated that this audit was submitted in compliance with City ordinances. He noted that the other HAC slated for the north part of the County was required to be completed by the end of the year, and the County had indicated it would be done in October. He advised that there had been some stipulations that the southeast lot be used for parking, storage, or recreational use, and there was a proposal to include day care. Therefore, the City Commission was asked to consider a site plan amendment to allow for enhancement of the assessment center.

Ms. Frances Esposito, Executive Director of the HAC, wished to collaborate with the County in order to combine the audit process from a time perspective. She explained that the ordinance required an audit after 6 months, so twice there had been audits in August. Ms. Esposito suggested that be moved to September, and the County had agreed, and it would also coincide with the City's audit as well. She advised that this would allow for production of all the same records at the same time.

Commissioner Moore had no objection to that idea and recommended approval. Commissioner Smith agreed. There were no objections.

Ms. Esposito referred to the north site. She reported that a groundbreaking ceremony had been planned, and an operations contract had been awarded. Ms. Esposito stated that the project was on schedule in accordance with the design/build contract, and the north HAC would be opened by December 31, 2001 or sooner.

Ms. Esposito had spoken to the Neighborhood Advisory Board on February 7, 2001, as well as to the individual Commissioners. She had presented the child care proposal and, after much discussion, it had been decided that the providers to be considered be limited to those in the City of Fort Lauderdale. Ms. Esposito noted that a list of potential providers had been distributed, and she reported that there were 1,100 homeless children registered with the School Board in Broward County, of which 536 were registered in Fort Lauderdale schools.

Ms. Esposito stated that the Neighborhood Advisory Board would receive additional information in March with respect to the potential providers. Commissioner Smith was amazed to hear there were 536 homeless children in Fort Lauderdale schools. Ms. Esposito explained that the goal was to further integrate resources at the HAC site into the community through this proposal. She advised that the idea of a childcare center had been met with some resistance, and it had been suggested that it be opened to the entire neighborhood. However, that would be contrary to the ordinance. Ms. Esposito stated that a final recommendation would be presented to the Advisory Board in March.

Commissioner Smith questioned the statistic that there were almost 32 homeless children in every Fort Lauderdale school. He thought the figures had been inflated to include those children who were living with grandparents, for example. He did not believe there were 536 kids "living in the woods."

Ms. Esposito displayed a site plan and pointed out the area for the assessment center. She proposed creation of an assessment center that would work in tandem with the Police Department's Outreach Team, which dropped off 5 or 6 individuals every evening and between 10:00 and 12:00 every weekend. She stated that those individuals could not be admitted to the general population until they had been assessed, so they had been put on the floor in the lobby. Ms. Esposito explained that visible security was also necessary for this group, so a two-story, 9,500 square foot assessment center was proposed on the site to accommodate 20 individuals.

Commissioner Smith wondered what the HAC did with those individuals the next morning. Ms. Esposito replied that they were fed breakfast and dinner, and almost 78% were accepted into the general population upon assessment. Those who were not admitted were discharged. Commissioner Smith said that was his major problem. He believed the ordinance specifically required that there be no "walk ins" or "walk outs" into the community. This troubled him greatly, particularly when there was discussion about expansion when the existing facility did not live up to the rules already.

Ms. Esposito believed the ordinance addressed "walk ins," but not "walk outs." Commissioner Smith was sure that had been the intent. Ms. Esposito advised that she had never received any complaints filed in this regard. Commissioner Smith asked her to consider his complaint the first. Ms. Esposito pointed out that there had also been a 27% overall decrease in crime in the area since the HAC opened. Commissioner Smith advised there had been a 40% decrease Citywide.

Commissioner Moore had no problem with the day care center or with the idea of other shelters located in Fort Lauderdale utilizing this center for day care. He pointed out that staff was available, and the day care center would not be competing with the private sector caregivers, and everyone would be transported to the site. As to the facility expansion, however, Commissioner Moore did not support the proposal. He understood that some individuals ended up on the floor in the lobby, but that was better than the ground outside, and they were still being afforded an opportunity to join the population. Commissioner Moore wanted to maintain the open green space and parking that was necessary.

Commissioner Moore was happy to hear that the Pompano HAC would be opening on schedule, and he applauded the operation of the Fort Lauderdale HAC. However, he did not want the facility ever expanded in any way. Commissioner Moore recalled community concerns about the facility being constructed in the first place, but it had been well run. However, he could not support expanding intake.

Commissioner Katz asked if the enhanced intake center would increase the number of clients accommodated by the HAC. Ms. Esposito replied that there would be no increase in the bed count from 200, but assessments could be conducted on the other 20 individuals. Commissioner Smith said that he had recently gone out with the Police Outreach Team, and a place for the people they encountered was necessary. He understood they went out every Thursdays, and the people they addressed were generally substance abusers. They would never be candidates for the HAC services, but they could be referred to other facilities appropriate for their conditions. Without the intake services, those individuals were not taken into the HAC program and were released unless referred.

Assistant Police Chief Bob Pusins reported that the Outreach Team went out 5 days per week and covered the entire community. Its role was to encourage those with mental or substance abuse problems to take advantage of the various facilities throughout the community. He advised that 78% of those taken to the HAC were admitted to appropriate programs. Chief Pusins, as a member of the Advisory Board, supported the proposal, although it was a policy decision for the City Commission.

Commissioner Moore believed that if “one foot was slipped in the door, the door would be wide open.” He understood success was being achieved despite the current limitations, and he was concerned that if there were one expansion, there would be additional expansions. Commissioner Moore did not feel Fort Lauderdale should have to take on any more of these services. Commissioner Hutchinson did not like the idea of people sleeping in the lobby, but she wondered if this additional space would really be necessary once the Pompano HAC was opened.

Ms. Esposito believed the additional intake would still be necessary but, if the Commission could not support the proposal today, she hoped they would leave the idea open until the Pompano HAC became operational. Commissioner Hutchinson did not think people should be sleeping in the lobby. If individuals could not be assessed after hours, she did not feel they should be brought to the HAC. She did not feel this was safe. Mayor Naugle believed the alternative was to leave them in the parks.

Commissioner Smith suggested that these individuals be brought to appropriate facilities. He thought perhaps the Broward Alcoholic Rehabilitation Center (BARC) should be expanded. Commissioner Moore thought that was a possibility, but he was opposed to any expansion of the HAC. Mayor Naugle pointed out that BARC was located in Sailboat Bend, and he believed that neighborhood had been impacted by social services more than any other. Commissioner Smith pointed out that the South Middle River Civic Association area had 47 social service centers. Mayor Naugle stated that the large facilities were in Sailboat Bend.

It was the consensus of the Commission to support the change in the audit date and the childcare center proposed, but it did not support any expansion of the HAC at this time. Commissioner Katz wanted to leave the door open in case the Pompano HAC did not fulfill this need, and a cap could be imposed. Commissioner Moore pointed out that there was already a cap and, if more beds were needed, the County should provide them. Commissioner Smith agreed.

Action: Change in audit date and creation of childcare center approved. Expansion of intake facility not approved.

II-A – Parks General Obligation Bond (GOB) Quarterly Report – Fourth Quarter 2000 (October – December)

A report was presented on the Parks GOB quarterly report for the fourth quarter of 2000 (October through December). Commissioner Katz understood there were some concerns about the Beach Community Center. Mr. Pete Sheridan, Assistant City Engineer, reported that the project was on schedule for an April completion date, although there had been some problems with subcontractors.

Commissioner Hutchinson inquired about the roller hockey facilities at Holiday Park. Mayor Naugle said there had been a lot of kids campaigning for the bond issue, door to door, because they had been promised roller hockey facilities. He stated that the Commission had also been made promises in this regard, and there had been no indications that would not be the case. Mayor Naugle thought this was a horrible example of “betrayal of the voters.”

The City Manager said Mayor Naugle had brought this to his attention after some correspondence from some citizens. He had told his staff to identify a funding source to fulfill the commitment, and he expected a response before the end of the week. At that time, he would provide a full report, but he believed the original estimates had been far too low. Mayor Naugle advised that one of the constituents had questioned the need for a dedicated parking area for the roller hockey facilities. He wondered if parking could be shared because it appeared over half the estimated cost was to build a parking lot.

Mr. Sheridan displayed the updated Holiday Park Master Plan and pointed out the proposed roller hockey facility. He explained that the original plan proposed during the bond issue had involved a facility shared with basketball. However, the two uses were not compatible, so staff had worked toward a separate facility. Mr. Sheridan advised the rink had been relocated behind the gymnasium but, because of the active soccer, football, social center, and the tennis center, there was not enough parking in this location for them all. He noted that if there was not a winter baseball league, the situation would not be as critical because that was the hockey season.

Mr. Sheridan reported that a parking analysis of the facility had been conducted, and it had been determined that the existing parking facility should be expanded in addition to some additional parking spaces in other areas to meet the needs of all the uses. However, there were concerns about drainage and aesthetics in the area near the tennis courts, but expansion of the existing parking area was needed to meet all the needs. Mr. Sheridan explained that another problem was that this facility required rehabilitation and reconfigured to gain additional spaces.

Mr. Sheridan said that in order to provide the roller hockey facility, it would be necessary to rebuild 170 parking spaces, and that accounted for the majority of the expense. Mayor Naugle understood that parking lot would need this work regardless of the hockey facility. Mr. Sheridan agreed it was full of potholes. He noted that when the original estimate for roller hockey had been prepared, a full, lighted roller hockey facility with boards had not been anticipated in Holiday Park. In fact, the bond issue had contained only \$75,000 for the purpose.

Mr. Sheridan reported that the original idea had been to place the roller hockey facility at Mills Pond Park, and staff had been finding that roller hockey facilities usually cost more than \$300,000, so funding had also become an issue. He stated that staff was seeking some County parks bond funding.

Commissioner Smith inquired about the Phase III parking along Federal Highway. Mr. Sheridan said that had been a concept involving Parker Playhouse, and he thought it was best to leave that area grassy for use when there was an overflow during events, etc. Commissioner Smith wondered if it was the best idea to "jam" the roller hockey facility in near the gym. Commissioner Hutchinson agreed it should be moved closer to the parking that was not used on a regular basis. Mr. Sheridan said staff had proposed the suggested location because then the concession building could be shared, along with the park attendants.

Commissioner Smith said he was receiving complaints about the lack of parking for the tennis center. Commissioner Moore believed there were parking spaces, but they were not as close as people would like. Commissioner Hutchinson agreed. Mr. Gizzi noted that the roller hockey facility could also be programmed from the gymnasium office. There were also not restrooms and other amenities closer to War Memorial Auditorium. Mr. Sheridan advised that 307 parking spaces were needed for the various uses, and there would be 300 spaces if the existing parking was expanded and rehabilitated. He believed it would cost almost \$1 million to do the parking project, provide one roller hockey rink, and realign the jogging path. Unfortunately, the bond issue had not anticipated an expenditure of this magnitude.

Mayor Naugle asked how much it would cost to provide two rinks. Mr. Sheridan estimated another \$300,000 would be necessary to add a second rink. Mayor Naugle understood County funding would be sought on the basis of this regional facility. Mr. Sheridan agreed that was the goal. Mayor Naugle pointed out that there were no roller hockey facilities in this region, although the County was providing these types of facilities elsewhere in Broward County. Mr. Sheridan agreed that was true. Mr. Gizzi noted this was not part of the Challenge Grant package, but it would be included in the applications that had regional impact.

Commissioner Moore wondered if Holiday Park was the best site for roller hockey. Mayor Naugle recalled that George English Park had been suggested originally. Mr. Gizzi advised that a small rink was planned for George English Park for younger children with portable boards. Commissioner Moore thought Riverland Park or Joseph C. Carter Park were possible alternate locations. He did not know why everything had to be in Holiday Park. Mr. Gizzi believed the original plan had been to place these facilities in Mills Pond Park, but that idea had been met with public resistance.

Commissioner Smith agreed Holiday Park was very crowded, and all the activities seemed to occur between 3:00 and 7:00 P.M. Mr. Sheridan agreed that was true, and that was why the parking facilities would have to be expanded. Commissioner Moore thought the project would be less expensive in another location that already had the necessary parking. Mayor Naugle suggested that the Parks, Recreation & Beaches Advisory Board be asked to give some input. Mr. Gizzi advised that the Board had considered the issue, and a lot of people had come to the meeting in favor of a Holiday Park location.

Mr. Ken Strand stated that the parking situation at Holiday Park was not too bad at times, but it was jammed when games were being played. He felt too much was being squeezed into this Park, and Mayor Naugle thought the additional parking was necessary even without the roller hockey rinks. He also felt they should be designed with dead ends to preclude "cruising." Mr. Strand recalled when parallel parking had been possible on 14th Avenue.

Action: Staff to explore alternate locations for roller hockey facilities.

III-B – Advisory Board Vacancies

1. Budget Advisory Board

Action: Deferred.

2. Cemeteries Board of Trustees

Action: Deferred.

3. Community Appearance Board

Action: Deferred.

4. Community Services Board

Action: Deferred.

5. Insurance Advisory Board

Action: Deferred.

6. Nuisance Abatement Board

Commissioner Smith understood the Chairman of this Board had submitted a letter of interest in serving on another board, and there were alternates who could serve. Mayor Naugle preferred to keep him on until there was an opening on the Beach Redevelopment Board. Commissioner Hutchinson believed the Board itself voted on the Chairperson. Commissioner Smith did not think there had ever been another Chairperson, and he did not feel the Board was very productive. Mayor Naugle suggested that election of officers be placed on the Board's next agenda.

Action: Deferred.

7. Unsafe Structures & Housing Appeals Board

Action: Deferred.

8. Marine Advisory Board

Commissioner Moore wanted to reinstate Kelvin Haynes to the Marine Advisory Board.

Action: Formal action to be taken at Regular Meeting.

At 5:50 P.M., the meeting was recessed. It was reconvened at 11:02 P.M.

IV – City Commission Reports1. Long Range City Plan

Commissioner Katz reported that the Joint Center would be presenting a proposal in a week or so for a long-range plan for the entire City. In addition, an Oversight Committee was putting together a list of goals in order to raise money within the community eventually. Mayor Naugle wondered if the Joint Center was working within the framework of the City's Comprehensive Plan. Commissioner Katz did not believe so, starting instead with what the Joint Center wished to accomplish, which was to connect all the different areas in a single vision.

Action: None.

2. ULI Seminar

Commissioner Katz had distributed some written material about the recent ULI Seminar, and she hoped to schedule a short workshop about the ULDR in this regard.

Action: As discussed.

3. County Summit

Commissioner Katz had recently attended the County's Summit with regard to Charter Review. Rather, they had discussed the most important issues in the County, and three of the six had been education, environment and transportation. Mayor Naugle reported that a recent three County conference had been held, and education, transportation and governance had been mentioned at that time.

Action: None.

4. 1880 South Federal Highway

Commissioner Hutchinson distributed copies of correspondence from Helen Ferris with regard to a motorcycle shop at 1880 South Federal Highway. She was concerned that the City did not have the ability to enforce the conditions imposed by the Board of Adjustment. On Sunday, she had observed motorcycles being displayed for sale outside. Further, the motel across the street had a sign indicating motel and Harley store parking. Commissioner Hutchinson wondered if there was any way to get this issue back to the Board of Adjustment because the City did not seem to have the ability to enforce the conditions.

Mayor Naugle said he had forwarded this complaint to the City Manager, and he had agreed to provide a report. Ms. Cecelia Hollar, Construction Services Director, stated that the Board of Adjustment had overruled an interpretation of the Zoning Administrator as to the use. Now, there was a question as to whether or not the issue could go back to the Board to readdress the conditions.

The City Attorney stated that he would have to review this matter and pursue means to get the matter back before the Board of Adjustment. In the meantime, the property owner would be notified.

Action: As discussed.

5. Margarita Island, Venezuela

Mayor Naugle recalled that Fort Lauderdale had entered into a Sister City relationship with Margarita Island, Venezuela. He reported that the Governor had recently visited Fort Lauderdale, and he had invited a group down to Margarita Island this weekend. Mayor Naugle and the City Manager planned to join the Sister City group.

Action: None.

Meeting adjourned at 11:08 P.M.

NOTE: A MECHANICAL RECORDING HAS BEEN MADE OF THE FOREGOING PROCEEDINGS, OF WHICH THESE MINUTES ARE A PART, AND IS ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK FOR A PERIOD OF TWO YEARS.